

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 31, 2003, claims 4-5, 13-14 and 17-18 have been canceled and claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 25 and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 6-12, 15-16 and 19-32 are in the case. The Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the present application.

Record is made of a telephonic interview between Applicants' attorney Edmond A. DeFrank and Examiner M. Heneghan on March 29, 2004. The Office Action of December 31, 2003, the cited references and the pending claims were discussed. A proposed amendment modifying claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 25 and 29 was discussed during the interview. Although no agreement was reached, the above amendments to the claims reflect the discussion between the Examiner and the Applicants' attorney during the interview.

The Office Action objected to the drawings as not including reference sign "100" on page 5 of the specification. In addition, the Office Action objected to the drawings as including reference signs "115," "132," and "134," that are not included in the specification.

In response, the Applicants have amended the specification on page to delete any occurrence of reference number "100" and to add elements "115," "132," and "134" to the specification on page 5 to be consistent with the drawings as originally filed. Hence, no new matter has been added. **As such, no drawing changes are required** and the Applicants submit that the objections to the drawings are overcome.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-17 and 19-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by "@Guard", by WRQ, Inc.

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The independent claims include displaying a safe color with a color coded graphical alert when one of the host servers requests one or more of the digital tracking components that contains information that is associated with the host server and sending an audible alert and displaying a warning color with the color coded

graphical alert and sending an audible alert when one of the host servers requests one or more of the digital tracking components that contains information that is not associated with the host server.

In contrast, "@Guard" does not disclose all of the Applicants' claimed features. For example, "@Guard" simply disclose the ability to block outbound cookies with minimal user control and monitoring. Although "@Guard" uses a dialog box pop up box to alert a user when outbound cookies are sent, "@Guard" clearly does not display a safe color with a color coded graphical alert when no cookie security breach and also does not send an audible alert and display a warning color when a cookie security breach is detected, like the Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, "@Guard" cannot anticipate the claims. As such, the Applicants' respectfully submit that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 5, 13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over "@Guard" in view of Reardon (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,562).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because at least one of the Applicants' claimed elements are missing from or not taught in the cited references and the Applicant's invention has advantages not appreciated by the cited references.

Specifically, the cited references, when combined, are missing the Applicants' claimed displaying a safe color with a color coded graphical alert when one of the host servers requests one or more of the digital tracking components that contains information that is associated with the host server and sending an audible alert and displaying a warning color with the color coded graphical alert and sending an audible alert when one of the host servers requests one or more of the digital tracking components that contains information that is not associated with the host server.

Hence, the combination of the "@Guard" reference with the Reardon reference does not disclose all of the elements of the Applicants' claims, and thus, cannot render the Applicants' invention obvious. In Re Evanega. This failure of the cited references, either alone or in combination, to disclose, suggest or provide

Serial No.: 09/615,772
Attorney Docket No.: AUS9-2000-0323-US1

motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP 2143).

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03).

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the subject application are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding claim rejections and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to expedite and further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: March 31, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX